DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 009 RC 006 235

AUTHOR Dommermuth, Paul R.; And Others
TITLE Cassadaga Valley: The Community Setting for Educational Innovation.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Fredonia. Teacher Education Research Center.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Community Characteristics; *Decision Making; *Educational Innovation; Models; *Research; *Rural Schools; *Sociology; Student Role; Teacher Role

AESTRACT

An attempt to chart the process of educational innovation in a rural school system in sociological terms is presented in this paper. As the system dynamics are described, the writers also attempt to extrapolate those aspects of the process which are common to other attempts at innovation, whether in education, health care, technological developments, or in seemingly unrelated areas like religion. The chief concern is to provide some sociological understanding of the mutual interaction, effects, and consequences of the interplay between the school system and community institutions. The manner in which innovations evolve, the mechanisms used for eliciting community reactions to them, the resulting problems for school personnel (teachers, students, and administrators(and community members, and the resolution of these conflicts may provide insight (1) at the theoretical level regarding innovation as a social process and (2) at the practical level in terms of a set of guidelines for those involved in innovation in other locations. The study includes a descriptive section on the nature of the innovations the system is attempting and the nature of the communities involved, a view of the decision-making process from the perspectives of teachers and administrators, a comparative view of school life as perceived by students and teachers, and the construction of an empirically-based model of innovation as a social process. (Author/LS)

ED 064009

RECEIVED
JUL 7 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC EA
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. SO

CASSADAGA VALLEY: THE COMMUNITY SETTING FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Paul R. Dommermuth
Department of Sociology and T.E.R.C.

Thomas A. Petrie

Ronald E. Hull

Daniel J. Bauman

Teacher Education Research Center
State University College
Fredonia, New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RC006235

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge with thanks the assistance and cooperation provided by officials of the Cassadaga Valley Central School (CVCS), students at CVCS and community members who supported the study. Special recognition is given:

Samuel Danton, Supervising Principal, CVCS
Fred Wilson, Redesign Project Coordinator, CVCS
Virginia Corsi, Redesign Historian, CVCS

This study, CASSADAGA VALLEY: THE COMMUNITY SETTING FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, was conducted by the Teacher Education Research Center, SUNY College at Fredonia, Kenneth G. Nelson, Director.

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 3, 1972, in Chicago.

Introduction

This paper represents an attempt to chart in sociological terms the process of educational innovation in a rural school system. As the system dynamics are described, the writers also attempt to extrapolate those aspects of the process which are common to other attempts at innovation, whether in education, health care, technological developments or in seemingly unrelated areas, like religion.

The chief concern then is to provide some sociological understanding of the mutual interaction, effects, and consequences of the interplay between the school system and community institutions. Hopefully the manner in which innovations evolve, the mechanisms used for eliciting community reactions to them, the resulting problems for school personnel (teachers, students and administrators) and community members, and the resolution of these conflicts may provide insight at the theoretical level regarding innovation as a social process and at the practical level in terms of a set of guidelines for those involved in innovation in other locations.

In general, the processes of innovation are not well documented. Most reports seldom go beyond the descriptive level. They lack adequate conceptualization. These reports usually involve attempts to force the data into categories necessary for the use of certain methodological procedures and techniques, which result in few theoretical gains. They often involve short time spans.

This study includes a descriptive section on the nature of the innovations the system is attempting, the nature of the communities involved, a view of the decision-making process from the perspectives of teachers and administrators, a comparative view of school life as perceived by students and teachers, and finally, the construction of an empirically based model of innovation as a social process.

In doing this research, a word about our value assumptions may be in order. We assume that people's attitudes cannot be changed in the simple fashion implied by many "reformers" today. As cognitive dissonance theorists have demonstrated, people's attitudes and behaviors are often incongruent. For example, agricultural changes and the introduction of sanitary facilities in underdeveloped nations are two outstanding cases.

The notion that innovation must be democratic, in the idealistic sense of the term, is also questioned. Many attempts to innovate fail because by making efforts to include all parties and to hear all points of view, programs may simply get "talked to death." Change usually involves shifts in social structure, which accounts for incongruous situations occasionally observed in which activities (the way things occur in schools) and attitudes (how subjects feel about an innovation) differ considerably.

With this preface, the program of innovation in Cassadaga Valley, known as Project Redesign, is discussed.

Project Redesign - How It Came About

To supplement local resources the Cassadaga Valley Central School (CVCS) personnel have sought and secured state and federal resources for a wide-range of special programs. Title I ESEA has provided resources for compensatory education; Title II has extended the district's library holdings. The Drop-out Prevention Program concentrates on making the school meaningful to potential drop-outs. The SUNY at Fredonia subsidized the Paraprofessional and the Pupil Oriented and Individualized System of Education (POISE) Programs which support individualization. NDEA Title III provided resources for educational television. The National Right to Read program is a source of personnel and other resources for reading and the program will soon be expanded into a comprehensive reading program. These involvements in change recently culminated in the district being designated as the rural New York Redesign prototype school by the State Education Department.

The aforementioned special purpose projects, initiated through state and federal resources, have many implications for school districts seeking to achieve mutual objectives. For example, POISE has fostered non-graded organizational units and team leaders. From the unit leaders and para-professional positions emerge a differentiated staff according to training, responsibility, and criteria of reward and status.

The "Right to Read" program is being implemented in one school, thereby differentiating the resources available to that particular school.

Undoubtedly priorities regarding organizational objectives have been re-ordered, if not in fact, changed. Thus, the organization is accommodating new positions. These positions precipitate different relationships among children and teachers.

It is evident that theoretical formulations and empirical research with respect to organizations reinforce the notion that changes in decision-making, activity, and attitudes are crucial dimensions of roles, and that changes in one dimension of a role precipitate changes in others. More specifically, changes in instructional methodology (teacher activity) and student grouping (student-teacher relationship) may precipitate changes in other relationships among individuals in the district schools and community. Undoubtedly, these changes are in various stages of emergence and resolution within the system. In short, the CVCS is a dynamic institution that has acquired program commitments and has re-structured roles to accomplish these commitments.

An analysis of the CVCS documents regarding individualization, non-graded grouping, differentiated staff, and the New York Redesign Plan implies that a quality educational program for the future can be achieved through: (1) the existing organization and resources, (2) self-sustaining processes and systems, (3) systems linking shared leadership patterns to maximize individual leadership acts as contrasted to con-serving leadership in a super-subordinate manner, and (4) adopting processes of change which account for the integration of all segments of the system.

In brief, the cited programs account for: (1) individual and organizational growth, (2) regenerative educational leadership among local, intermediate and state educational agencies, (3) students, parents, professional and community input regarding education for the future, and (4) conflict resolution.

In the district adaptation of POISE and Redesign, two important characteristics of individualized instruction are: (1) a pupil-teacher shared frame of reference; and (2) student participation in selection of curricular experience appropriate to learning objectives. These characteristics require that responsibility for communication rests with the instructor and probably demands the shared competence of a differentiated staff to insure that appropriate instruction, grouping, and curricular alternatives are available to accomplish learning goals. These two conditions, one process (grounded in the child's identity) and the other organizational (grounded in resources and authority) are ways of viewing the development of individualization and redesign in Cassadaga Valley Central Schools (CVCS).

The CVCS has reorganized their instructional staff to accomplish the above through staff differentiation. To meet the requirements of their youth, new roles and positions are on the formal organizational chart. Furthermore, a review of activity and authority patterns reveal these roles and positions to be in a state of change.

The CVCS district is involved in many programs which bring resources to accomplish goals that it would not be able to accomplish independently. The goals of the respective programs are theoretically complementary. However, the change in roles to accomplish the complementary goals is an aspect of planned change yet to be accomplished.

The Community Setting of Innovation

This study focuses on a school system covering a relatively large area. It is located in Western New York and covers about 150 square miles. The system includes four small rural hamlets and all or part of nine townships. The population is sparse. There are 6500 people in the district and they comprise about 4 1/2 per cent of the total population of the large county in which the district is located.

The majority of this population inhabit four rural hamlets which were banded together in the late 1930's into one of the state's first centralized school districts. These hamlets contain about 950 (A)*, 600 (B), 950 (C), and 350 (D) people respectively. Each contains an elementary school, with the junior-senior high school located in community "C."

The county and the district are primarily agricultural. About 45 per cent of the county's population is classified as rural, while all of the district's population is so classified. The county contains a significantly larger number of elderly people and a significantly

---

*Letters identify the four communities.

smaller number of young adults than state and national averages according to the 1960 census. In addition, the patterns of migration have produced a net growth in population of under 20,000 since the 1950 census.

Econcomically the area is not well off. For the past year unemployment has varied from about 7 per cent to 10 per cent. Social security benefits and welfare payments have increased tremendously over the past 25 years. Personal income per capita has increased steadily over this same period of time. However, when compared to the rest of upstate New York, and the whole state, the county clearly lags far behind. Simple comparative figures on the ratio of employment to unemployment show the lack of economic growth; the ratio of the 1960 census figures developed by the U.S. Department of Commerce are remarkably similar to that of the 1940 census.

One final comment about the socio-economic levels of the county may be made. This county, along with its neighbor, has such a sharply defined picture of economic stagnation that it is included in the area known as Appalachia and as such has access to most of the "non-existent" funds available to its neighbors to the south.

An outstanding sociological feature of the system is the fact that it includes the four hamlets mentioned earlier. These towns have distinct social profiles and struggle constantly to maintain their identities. In terms of social and demographic characteristics they are remarkably alike. However, the residents of each manifest a strong sense of community identification, as illustrated in later portions of the paper.

The value orientations of the villages are clear illustrations of small town Americana. In terms of patterns of religious affiliation the communities vary from predominantly fundamentalist to a mixed religious community which includes on its borders a well known Spiritualist center. Religious values become apparent, albeit in a somewhat veiled manner, as indicated by community consensus with respect to educational innovation. At public meetings new attitudes about family and community life are questioned, e.g., students should have some control over what happens to them vs. students should do as they are told and respect authority.

Politically the hamlets are homogeneous and conservative when compared against the full range of alternatives observed on today's political scene. There is a close link between political values and the values of the marketplace as viewed from the perspective of small business men. The prevailing themes of politics are a low-tax expenditure and the erosion of local autonomy to such organizations as state, regional and federal agencies. The main areas of political life are school politics and township politics, the latter dealing with such issues as the care and accessibility of roads in the winter.

Community Involvement

Project Redesign is based on the value of community involvement, an involvement at more than just an advisory level. This structure has two basic levels. First, there are four basic redesign committees. Each is

composed of students, town citizens, teachers and non-teaching staff members. They each have chairmen and/or vice chairmen. A level above these committees is a redesign planning council. It consists of two chief administrators, the chairmen of the redesign committees, the state and local coordinators, a management consultant, a school board member, and representatives from regional school organizations, such as those involving cooperative educational services.

The redesign committees meet once a month to: develop projects; react to actions of the planning council; make specific recommendations; and convey information to and from each of the various constituencies they represent. The members of these committees were elected from their groups, that is, citizen members were chosen in a system-wide election, students by the student body, teachers by the whole district faculty and the non-teaching staff by an all-district election.

The planning council, which represents various intra-community levels as well as extra-community agencies, was created in the Fall of 1971. It meets twice a month to review projects, launch new ones, coordinate on-going activities and inform the various interest groups of events on which they may (or should) take action. This model of school-community involvement places new responsibilities both on the school system and the community.

For example, the traditional pattern of community involvement with the school system has been one with relatively clear or fixed boundaries

on inter-group relations, except for some institutionalized areas like the school board, P.T.A., and sports-related rituals which pass for active community involvements. For the most part, communities are content to leave school matters in the hands of professionals. These boundaries are crossed only when something extraordinary happens.

From the perspective of the professional staff this position is further documented by the responses of teachers to the appearance of parents and other community members. Teachers and administrators tend to respond to these visits in terms of "what's-the-trouble-now?" stances.

At the organizational level teachers and administrators involved in Redesign develop modes of social interaction with students and community members which go beyond the traditional boundaries mentioned above. An authentic partnership requires role behavior to which they are unaccustomed. Problems do arise and in the following sections some of the difficulties illustrate the types of concerns innovations may precipitate.

Up to this point the basic concern has been with setting the stage for the reader's understanding of what the innovation involved, what the communities are like and how these community involvements differ from typical school-town ties. In the following section the focus will be on three specific sets of data. The first deals with a busing controversy, a timely subject give the unsettling events of the past few months. The second examines the perceptions elementary teachers and administrators have about the process of decision-making in the areas of curriculum,

pupil personnel, business, staff personnel and school-community ties. The last portion deals with the differential perceptions students and teachers have of the school system.

School Busing - The Tip of the Iceberg

In April of 1971 a reorganization of the elementary system was proposed to the community by the chief school officer at a school board meeting. This change involved the fourth and fifth grades. Each of the elementary schools in each of the four hamlets mentioned above would now have a primary unit, housing grades K through three. Grades four and five would now be consolidated in the elementary schools of the two larger villages and would be termed the intermediate level. The reorganization would require the busing of the pupils in grades four and five from the two smaller towns to the two larger ones. It should be mentioned that all sixth graders are presently bused to the elementary school in the town in which the junior-senior high school is located.

The rationale for this reorganization was that the schools in the two smaller villages were overcrowded and this was not the case in the larger towns. This move would allow all of the fourth and fifth grade teachers to be housed in two buildings and this would provide more opportunities for them to work together, particularly in the program of individualizing instruction. The present situation afforded no space in the two smaller units for activities such as speech therapy, the school psychologist, library media center, music classes and testing

programs. In addition, it was reasoned that this reorganization would increase the utilization of space without capital expenditures.

At the meeting where this plan was introduced the board elected to table the vote until community sentiments were made known. In the meantime the school superintendent was instructed to visit the faculty involved and to meet with parents groups to explain the proposed change. The community response to this proposal was widespread, quite mixed in range and most vigorous in nature. There were petitions, neighborhood meetings, organized telephone surveys and significant turnouts at community and board of education meetings in which the reorganization was explained. In addition, many folks used the editorial pages of the two local papers to present their views and challenge the plan. One meeting with the concerned parents in one of these communities attracted over 100 local residents.

For the most part, the discussions involved variations on the following themes. First, this realignment was viewed by some residents as the first move in a series which would eventually result in the loss of both schools in the smaller villages, the thinking being that it would be financially unsound to continue the arrangement of having four separate elementary schools. The second theme expressed revolved around doing things in the best interests of the fourth and fifth grade students, which really was a sub-set of the idea of doing things in the best interests of the community.

The third, and by far most vital, issue to surface was concerned with the erosion of a strong sense of community identity on the part of residents and the subsequent loss of local autonomy to "outside" agencies. This issue strikes at the heart of many community conflicts. It strikes a response from many small-townsmen who are frustrated at every turn by the dictates of agencies and organizations over which they have little or no control. Big business, big government and big labor control vast chunks of social life (and not just in small towns). The dissonance between the values community members hold and the facts of social participation can only be dealt with at high social psychological costs.

During this three-hour meeting the issue or reorganization was buried on numerous occasions. The meeting presented opportunities for many residents to vent their feelings on innovation in general, the erosion of authority under experimental programs which included non-graded classes, the negative effects brought about by less individual competition, the soaring tax rates, the poor career prospects of children trained in such schools, and a host of appeals to the traditional values of yesterday.

The issue of fourth and fifth grade reorganization was not voted on at the May meeting of the school board. It was finally accepted by the board at the June meeting. At this meeting the authority of the Board to take such action was questioned. Those opposed to this move argued that such action could not take place without voter approval from the communities involved. A copy of the State Education Law was obtained. According to a section dealing with the issue of system

centralization in 1938 and revised in 1964, it was ascertained that the board in fact did have such power. After much heated debate the issue passed unanimously and the reorganization, necessary for continuing a program of individualized instruction, was set in motion.

A number of matters need examination in this critical incident. First, the proposal was initiated after being considered by a curriculum council representing all the constituencies in the system. Second, opportunities to question the move were given and enough time was allowed to avoid the criticism of the issue being "high pressured into approval" without community opposition. Third, the involvement of the community was not superficial, although critics are quick to point out the opposite. Fourth, the close cooperation of the system and the board is manifest. The board is an atypical one and gives every evidence of being committed to innovation, as long as it has been examined by all segments of the community.

In the next two sections evidence is presented which shows that although the overall idea of innovation may be accepted, the operating details are subject to considerable questioning on the parts of two major segments of this system, namely, teachers and students.

Decision-Making Structures

As noted in references to the various program involvements in CVCS, there has emerged a differentiation of staff positions. For example,

in the elementary school, there are formal positions of paraprofessional and unit leaders. Four to seven teachers now make up instructional units. Personnel in these units collaborate in planning curricular activities. The unit leader is responsible for coordinating and representing the unit on the system-wide curriculum council. Each unit is supported by a paraprofessional who performs a wide variety of tasks. Involvement of new teachers in group decision-making regarding curriculum and pupil personnel matters is thought to have increased. Teachers do meet, discuss and are represented on the curriculum council.

To obtain staff perceptions of decision-making processes, the Decision Point Analysis* was administered to all elementary school and central office personnel. This questionnaire consists of twenty-five items about teacher perceptions of their involvement and their decision-making role with respect to critical educational decisions. The questionnaire requires respondents to identify the hierarchical involvement of staff members and also their own role with respect to each decision. The data presented in the following matrixes represent the degree of staff consensus in the respective schools regarding their involvement in the twenty-five decisions and the extent that individuals, attributed to be involved, perceived responsibility for the involvement. For example, in School A (Figure #2) there was consensus regarding three business decisions, in that fifty percent of the staff (criterion level of agreement per consensus is that fifty percent or more agree) concur with respect to who is involved in making particular

---

*Glenn, Eye et.al., Relationships Between Instructional Change.

decisions. On the other hand, there is less than fifty percent agreement as to who is involved or the acceptance of responsibility for the attributed involvement with regard to two business items. The four matrixes reveal substantially different distributions regarding staff perceptions of the decision-making involvements and the propensity to accept responsibility for the perceived involvements.

The Decision Point Analysis measures decision-making with respect to five functional educational areas. These areas are curriculum, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school community, and business. Figure one presents the data from the four buildings.

Figure #1

Consensus Regarding Staff Involvement in Twenty-Five Administrative Decisions

Perceived Responsibility for Involvement or Attributed Involvement

	Consensus = 61	Non Consensus = 39
Accepted or Claimed 36	B* 7 C 8 PP 6 SC 5 SP 4	B 1 PP 4 SP 1
Rejected or Incongruent 64	B 6 C 2 PP 4 SC 10 SP 9	B 6 C 10 PP 6 SC 5 SP 6

B* = Business
C = Curriculum
PP = Pupil Personnel
SC = School Community
SP = Staff Personnel

The data reveal staff consensus in the respective schools on sixty-one of the one hundred decision items (four decision groups times 25 decisions). However, the responsibility for the decisions by those involved was congruent in thirty-six instances. Thirty-six decisions had a fifty percent level of agreement, while responsibility was not accepted for making the decision in sixty-four of the one hundred decisions.

Individual building data are shown in the figures two through five. The building responses vary radically. School A has a consensus on eleven items with respect to involvement in decision-making. Congruence is apparent with respect to four decisions.

Figure #2

School A

Consensus Regarding Staff Involvement in Twenty-Five Administrative Decisions

Perceived Responsibility for Involvement or Attributed Involvement

	Consensus = 11	Non Consensus = 14
Accepted or Claimed = 4	B 3 PP 1	
Rejected or Incongruent = 21	PP 1 SC 4 SP 2	B 2 C 5 PP 3 SC 1 SP 3

Figure #3

School B

Consensus Regarding Staff Involvement in
Twenty-Five Administrative Decisions

Perceived Responsibility for Involvement or Attributed Involvement

	Consensus = 20		Non Consensus = 5	
Accepted or Claimed = 14	C	4		
	PP	2	PP	2
	SC	4		
	SP	2		
Rejected or Incongruent = 11	B	3		
	C	1	B	2
	PP	1	SC	1
	SP	3		

In School B there is general consensus as to who is involved in decision-making. However, even though there is agreement on involvement in decision-making, there is a tendency for staff members to shirk responsibility for those decisions.

The School A community appears to have a much more diverse constituency. Staff involvement is strong only in school-community matters. But acceptance of decision-making responsibility for involvement is essentially lacking. Only in business decisions is there agreement.

Taken as a whole, involvement in decision-making and acceptance of responsibility for those decisions is slow. With respect to how the decision-making system is used, it is apparent that involvement in decision-making is better understood than is shared perception regarding the extent to which an individual makes the decision. Of particular import is the propensity for decisions to be attributed to groups (the curriculum council and board of education). These groups are perceived to be decision makers by both superordinate and subordinate staff members. In short, the decision-making involvements and perceptions of accountability for the decisions are discrepant and diffuse.

The data reveal that activity regarding decisions varies among the schools, especially with respect to curriculum and school-community matters. These matters are critical components which the externally funded programs are designed to change. It is apparent that there is a wide range of perceptions with respect to these matters. In particular, the polarization of School B and School A regarding pupil personnel matters may reflect the dual role of School B faculty members as community members. Fifty percent of the School B faculty occupy this dual role as compared to School A where the faculty are essentially non-residents. Furthermore, School A is a multi-religious and ethnic community while School B is more homogeneous. An analysis of the data reveal that there were sixty-one items in which there was consensus regarding involvement. Thirty-one of these items were congruent regarding acceptance of responsibility. However, on the whole, acceptance of responsibility was rejected or misunderstood.

As noted previously, the elementary schools have formally developed the positions of paraprofessional and unit leader. In particular, the involvement of teachers in decision-making regarding curriculum and pupil personnel matters has theoretically increased. This involvement in unit meetings and curriculum council matters extends the teachers' involvement to a wider arena. For the teachers do meet, discuss and make decisions regarding children. Undoubtedly, there is some shift of perceived decision-making to the curriculum council. However, there is some incongruity about the location of decisions inasmuch as team leaders, administrators and the board of education are viewed as collectively making most decisions. Secondly, it is evident that there is a wide discrepancy regarding staff involvement in and responsibility for initiation of new programs. An example of considerable importance is the change of policy regarding the providing of equitable per pupil resources in the respective communities. The funding agency now dictates otherwise and accommodations are being made.

The final data portion of the paper relates the perceptions of students and teachers to the differential sets of social contingencies to which they respond. Teachers are interested in improving work conditions and maximizing their own autonomy. They are subjected to constant pressures from administrators, students and parents. The security of being "masters" of subject areas, the need to be "in control" and the implications which change have for their roles in schools are all in a state of flux. Correspondingly, pupils find that demands upon them have changed considerably.

To be actively engaged in decision-making is new. On one hand they welcome the opportunities and constantly test the limits of their "autonomy." They often become impatient and respond with charges of educational tokenism.

The data with regard to perceptions of school life came from secondary students and teachers. A universe of 70 teachers and a 50 percent sample numbering 300 students responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed by a major educational research organization. It deals with two crucial problems, namely, views of what the school is like and views of what it should be like. The full analysis of these problems awaits the arrival of the views of a sample of school system residents.

The overwhelming view one gets from both the data and the construction of the questionnaire is one which depicts the school as an agency of social control. Underlying tensions manifest themselves in numerous ways. With regard to school regulations and rules students perceive a need to "get permission to do anything around here." In contrast teachers feel this is not quite true. Teachers generally contend that students can do what they want during free periods, study halls and lunch period; students feel constrained. Students tend to see rules for student behavior to be more consistent than do teachers.

Shifting to the specific area of negative sanctions the same patterning of view occurs. Teachers perceive fewer arguments between students and themselves than do students. This same pattern occurs in the perception

of fights among students. Likewise, students hear about teachers hitting students more often than teachers hear about such happenings. Teachers rarely feel that students are punished without reason; students do not agree.

When the data are examined on how the school ought to be, similar discrepancies occur. Teachers see the "best" preparation of students for the future in terms of highly structured learning environments and control of students. Students respond with an emphasis on an increased role in the decision-making process and more emphasis on human relations skills. Both groups, however, stress the need for interesting and relevant classes.

If they had their preferences, students would like a school in which they have the final say in matters which concern them. Teachers definitely don't want to work in such a school. The ideal school situation from the perspectives of the teachers is one which differs considerably from what administrators, students and parents want. The important feature of these data is that each group accurately perceives how the other groups would differ. In short, the scarce commodity here is power and influence. Traditional approaches to innovation often fail because they are imposed along lines which follow the hierarchical organization of schools as bureaucratic organizations. As such, they fail to recognize the tremendous power available to such parties as students and teachers in terms of supporting or hindering the innovation.

The views of such constituencies as those illustrated in the previous portions of the paper have crucial implications for the succession of innovation. The following guidelines may be inferred from these data.

For innovation to have any chances for success the school system itself must include certain ingredients. First, a strong administrative team is needed, one with enough professional confidence and patience to avoid heavy-handed efforts which run roughshod over the concerns of school boards, parents, teachers and students. This means that some overriding philosophy must be developed which includes the inputs of the above constituencies. This is based on a political process; as such it demands an enlightened view of administration which goes beyond the narrow, dollar-and-cents perspectives of many school leaders.

In addition, these leaders must have a well developed overview of innovation which goes beyond the simplistic notions which bring in new programs and technology but fail to anticipate the consequences of these changes.

Given the existence of such a team with the support of a progressive school board the first task consists of creating a community climate which forces system residents out of their typical patterns of relating to school personnel. The usual stance of residents is to leave the operation of schools to professionals with little concern for what's happening. This continues until some conflict arises based on value discrepancies between school personnel and townspeople.

Successful innovation in a whole system requires townspeople to be in on changes at the start and with the full realization that they are there for other than token reasons. Since this involves a process of constant political negotiation, it implies that innovation is not a product but a process with continual reappraisal as an integral part of the process.

One major problem in the innovative process involves the differential rates of acceptance among various segments of the community. In this study the somewhat ready acceptance of the community is based on statements of general purpose and overall goals. The operative details, which involve the professionals and the students, are much more difficult to achieve. Teachers and students are most affected by these changes and often are reluctant to step out in new directions. This leads to the next set of implications, which are organizational.

At the organizational level these shifts in school goals lead to shifts in the interrelationships among school units. Teachers are called upon to perform new activities. In addition the role obligations to members of their role-set change. These changes often are fraught with anxiety because they include dropping many behavior patterns which have become the criteria for professional evaluation and the mark of professional autonomy.

Three specific role relationships may shift for teachers. With innovating administrators they must adapt and at the same time keep in mind that these adjustments are still within the context of superior-subordinate

organizational levels. It is understandable that such moves often are under tense conditions when one looks at the uneasy equilibrium between the two groups.

The same general pattern exists with students and parents to a considerable degree. The name of the game with students in the past has been "control." Giving up such role expectations requires the introduction of some new behavior in their place. As noted earlier the innovations do not appear with neat formuli for them to substitute, instead new expectations must be forged in much the same fashion as the blacksmith image suggests.

For many teachers, parents traditionally evoke images of "trouble." Teachers become concerned by keeping such meetings within very structured limits and worry about the repercussions these meetings may have with their administrators. The introduction of parents as a member of teachers' role-set along lines other than the above becomes a problem much like the ones with students and school administrators.

In short, if the school is viewed as a social system, innovations which change the role expectations of many of the various unit members present strains and potential role conflicts for members of all units.

The final area for discussion is the area of teacher training. Students trained (and the use of the term is deliberate) in traditional programs with the current modes of student teacher supervision enter innovative systems with definite handicaps. Much of the learning of college has to be unlearned. It should be noted that these problems are

not specific to education. Our own research with internists, psychiatrists, biochemists, pharmacists and other health professions indicate that the reality shock upon entry into the world of practice is widespread. In this project we suggest that not only is this reality shock present but it may be of a different and more severe nature than many of our colleagues recognize.

In part this gap between training and practice is maintained by the distinct patterns of aloofness (and at times outright snobbishness) between colleges of education and schoolmen. Both sides develop vested interests in guarding their "turf." Local schools control opportunities college staffs have for learning from the "real world." College staffs take stances which often do not recognize the contributions to be made by area school staffs.

In closing it can be noted that educational reforms and innovations which do not include close cooperation and mutual respect between training institutions and regional schools stack the deck against their own success. They may be successful but the effort involved will be considerably more.

It is our guess at this stage of the innovative process in this rural prototype school that this system's chances of success are substantially greater than similar models in suburban or city systems. While all the data have not been examined it is our impression that size alone, and of course, the related heterogeneity accompanying it, in the latter systems complicate and make more difficult the process of innovation.

Figure #4

School C

Consensus Regarding Staff Involvement in
Twenty-Five Administrative Decisions

Perceived Responsibility for Involvement or Attributed Involvement	Consensus = 16		Non Consensus = 9	
Accepted or Claimed = 9	B	2		
	C	3	PP	2
	PP	1		
	SP	1		
Rejected or Incongruent = 16	B	3	C	2
	PP	1	PP	1
	SC	3	SC	2
	SP	2	SP	2

Figure #5

School D

Consensus Regarding Staff Involvement in
Twenty-Five Administrative Decisions

Perceived Responsibility for Involvement or Attributed Involvement

	Consensus = 14	Non Consensus = 11
Accepted or Claimed = 9	C 1 B 2 PP 2 SC 2 SP 1	B 2 SP 1
Rejected or Incongruent = 16	C 1 PP 1 SC 3 SP 2	B 2 C 3 PP 2 SP 1 SC 1